DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 523 FL 001 887

AUTHOR	Hagiwara, Michio Peter
TITLE	Leadership in Foreign-Language Education: Trends in Training and Supervision of Graduate Assistants.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association, New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
SPONS AGENCY	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	51p.
AVAILABLE FROM	MLA Materials Center, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges, Cooperating Teachers, Educational Trends, Education Courses, *Graduate Students, Graduate Study, Inservice Courses, Inservice Teacher Education, *Language Instruction, Modern Languages, *Preservice Education, School Surveys, *Supervisory Methods, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Teacher Educator Education, *Teaching Assistants, Teaching Experience, Universities

ABSTRACT

Based on an analysis of some 157 replies to a survey on the training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants, sponsored by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, this study examines current trends in the type of supervision being offered by language departments. Principal sections focus on: (1) teaching assistantships, (2) preservice training, (3) inservice training, and (4) supervisors. Several charts include information on teaching assistantship stipends, supervision and training, statistical data on pre- and inservice training, background data on supervisors, and reduction in the teaching load. Several preteaching workshop programs are described. A classified, annotated bibliography is contained in the report. (RL)

ED041523

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Leadership in Foreign-Language Education: Trends in Training and Supervision of Graduate Assistants

Michio P. Hagiwara

FL 001 887

ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and of English in Higher Education
Modern Language Association, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York 10011

The MLA/ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages was initiated by the Modern Language Association in June 1966 as part of a national network of such Clearinghouses, each responsible for improving the collection and dissemination of current information relevant to research and development in its own area of education. The ERIC system was organized and is coordinated by the United States Office of Education, and includes an ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) from which many significant documents (reports, monographs, surveys, articles, etc.) may be purchased in hard copy or microfiche form. An informational brochure is available from MLA/ERIC.

This report has its genesis in an original article by the author, Professor Michio Peter Hagiwara, entitled "Training and Supervision of College Foreign Language Teachers" appearing in Foreign Language Annals, 3 (October 1969). In the fall of 1969, Professor Hagiwara, in cooperation with ACTFL and the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL), undertook a survey of training programs for graduate teaching assistants in foreign-language departments, the results of which formed the basis of discussion sessions conducted by the author at the Annual Meeting of ACTFL in November 1969 and at a meeting of ADFL held during the MLA Convention in December 1969. A preliminary report also appeared in the ADFL Bulletin, 1 (March 1970).

All contents of this report may be freely quoted or reproduced without special permission. Points of view or opinions expressed in this ERIC publication do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

This report will be processed into the ERIC Document Reproduction Service and become available in hard copy or microfiche. The Modern Language Association has printed a quantity of copies at its own expense, for sale through the MLA Materials Center.

1970

MLA Materials Center

62 Fifth Avenue

New York, N.Y. 10011

ED041523

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

I. Introduction 3

II. Teaching Assistantships 5

III. Pre-Service Training 9

IV. In-Service Training 12

V. Supervisors 18

Conclusion 20

Charts

I. Teaching-Assistantship Stipends 22

II. Type of Supervision and Training 23

III. Tabulation of Replies on Pre-Service Training . . 24

IV. Tabulation of Replies on In-Service Training . . 27

V. Background of Supervisors and Assistant Supervisors 33

VI. Reduction in Teaching Loads 34

VII. Attitude Toward Reduction in Teaching Loads . . 35

Preteaching Orientation Programs 36

Example of a Three-Day Program

University of Michigan–Department of Romance Languages (French) 38

Example of a Four-Day Program

Harvard University–Department of Romance Languages (French) 39

University of California at Los Angeles–Department of Germanic Languages 40

University of Wisconsin–Department of Spanish and Portuguese 41

Example of a Five-Day Program

Brown University–Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies 41

Annotated Bibliography

General 43

Description of Specific Programs 45

On the Course in Methods/Applied Linguistics 46

On Teaching Performance Evaluation 47

Items Related to Demonstration of General Teaching Techniques (for Preteaching Workshops) 47

Handbooks Published by Departments 49

PREFACE

This study is based on the analysis of the 157 replies to the survey on the training and supervision of teaching assistants sponsored by ACTFL and ADFL. Although it does not provide conclusive data on the administrative and supervisory activities of the lower-level courses at institutions where graduate assistants are employed, it reveals general trends in the type of supervision offered by many language departments. As a rule, large departments appeared to give an extensive preteaching as well as in-service program whereas small departments seemed to depend on the informal contacts of the assistants with their supervisors and faculty advisors. It was evident in nearly all cases that attempts were being made to prepare the graduate students for their immediate teaching assignments. Yet the training in practical rather than theoretical aspects of language instruction might need further improvements. Moreover, a large number of supervisors and their associates held nontenured positions, and many were dissatisfied with their current rate of reduction in teaching loads for their special duties. This study points out some of the needs of language departments for the strengthening of their graduate-assistant supervision and training programs.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past decade an increase in the enrollment of lower-level language courses has resulted in an extensive use of graduate students as teaching assistants in many institutions. Undoubtedly, this arrangement has enabled language departments to staff these courses economically and, at the same time, provide not only financial aids to graduate students but also an opportunity for them to acquire classroom experience before they receive their degrees. Our growing concern is with the quality of these undergraduate courses and the instructors who are assigned to teach them. In December 1960 the Committee on College French of the American Association of Teachers of French urged the Association to create a special committee to study the use of graduate assistants in French departments. This committee was to establish minimum standards of language competence and desirable conditions of employment and supervision, and to explore the suitable areas of pre-service training for the graduate students.[1] Unfortunately, nothing seems to have come out of this proposal. In 1963 a survey undertaken by the Modern Language Association indicated that nearly 60 percent of the 51 departments that responded gave practically no training to their assistants. It further revealed that the average department offered no course in teaching methods and procedures, made no arrangements for class visits for the evaluation of teaching performance, and provided no effective means of supervision.[2]

In the fall of 1969 the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and Association of Departments of Foreign Languages sponsored a study of the training and supervision of graduate assistants in modern languages. The questionnaire devised for this study was comprised of some forty-five questions concerning general aspects and fifty-eight additional questions on details of the college-instructor-preparation program. These items were based on the various recommendations made by the MLA and the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages as well as the practices reported by several large language departments.[3] The questions were grouped into four major categories

[1] Report of the Committee on College French (mimeo), AATF, 29 Dec. 1961. pp. 2-3.

[2] Archibald MacAllister, "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," PMLA, 79 (May 1964), 30; this report is reprinted in MLJ, 50 (1966), 400-15.

[3] Principal recommendations on the training of graduate assistants for their future career are found in: Jack M. Stein, "Preparation of College and University Language Teachers," PMLA, 86 (May 1961), 12-14; Stein et al., "The Preparation of College and University Teachers," in Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Report of the Working Committees, 1961, ed. Seymour L. Flaxman (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 32-41; Norman P. Sacks, "Training the New College Instructor," in Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages (New York: MLA, 1961), pp. 176-78 (reprinted in MLJ, 50 [1966], 66-69); and MacAllister's article cited, n. 2. Reports of various practices are found in: Henry H. H. Remak, "The Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in German," MLJ, 41 (1957), 212-14 (German, Indiana Univ.); John Winkelman, "Training College Language Teachers," MLJ, 44 (1960), 210-16 (German, Univ. of Nebraska); Francis W. Nachtman, "Practical Training Program for College Language Teachers," MLJ, 47 (1963), 11-13 (French, Univ. of Illinois); John B. Dalbor, "A Realistic Look at the Training of College Foreign-Language Teachers," MLJ, 51 (1967), 209-14 (Spanish, Pennsylvania State Univ.); Michio P. Hagiwara, "Training and Supervision of College Foreign Language Teachers," FLA, 3 (Oct. 1969), 90-107 (French, Univ. of Michigan). Other articles that furnished some of the questions will be cited in appropriate places.

consisting of: (1) Teaching Assistantships, (2) Pre-Service Training, (3) In-Service Training, and (4) Supervisors. By mid-December a total of 157 replies from 151 language departments, representing 92 universities in 39 states, were received. Not included in this figure were three replies that stated that there were as yet no definite training programs, four replies indicating that graduate assistants were mostly employed for research, tutorial work, correction of tests and papers, and occasional substitute teaching, and five replies reporting that there were supervision programs only for beginning full-time teachers.

A preliminary analysis of the results indicated that supervision and training programs varied widely from one department to another, and at times within the same department, according to different language divisions.[4] Generally speaking, small departments tended to have minimal programs and to be dependent on the so-called osmotic learning through contacts with the senior faculty members. On the other hand, large departments seemed to have elaborate systems with clearly defined responsibilities for supervisors, course heads, and experienced teaching assistants. Obviously, an all-inclusive statistical report would have resulted in a misleading picture of the situations existing in departments of different sizes. It was decided, therefore, to divide the replies into three groups of approximately equal numbers and show separate as well as total tabulations.[5] The mean and range of the number of teaching assistants (TA's) in the small (S), middle-sized (M), and large (L) departments, total figures (T), and the number of samples are given below:

	S	M	L	T
No. of samples	53	55	49	157
Mean no. of TA's	4.8	15.2	38.3	13.7
Range of TA's	1–9	10–23	24–82	1–82

At the outset it should be mentioned that this study suffers not only from the usual limitation imposed by small samples but also from the difficulty of classifying some of the replies. The number of responses coming from only one language division out of several in a department (such as a reply from the French division of a department of Romance languages) was 17, divided into 3 small, 5 middle, and 9 large groups. Since it would have been wasteful to discard these samples, we had to assume that the practice described by a single division was typical of the general pattern prevailing in the department. Fortunately, the number of graduate assistants indicated in these replies were such that, had their departments

[4] The preliminary analysis treating the middle-sized and large groups from the responses received by early November 1969 was published in the ADFL Bulletin 1 (March 1970), 37-44. Copies were also distributed at the 1969 Annual Meeting of the ACTFL in New Orleans.

[5] The three groups were not of exactly equal numbers due to some replies received after the preliminary processing of the data had begun.

made combined reports representing all the division, only three of the seventeen would have changed their status, two from S to M, and one from M to L. Still another problem was posed by two middle-sized and two large multiple-language departments that had let each language division fill out a copy of the questionnaire (for instance, a department of modern European languages had its French, Spanish, and German divisions answer our survey separately). An examination of these replies showed that practices differed among the divisions only according to their relative size and followed the tendency stated earlier. Since it would have been difficult to pool these separate replies and make a composite answer representing one department, each division was treated as if it had been an independent department. Thus what would have been 2M and 2L were tabulated as 3S, 4M, and 3L. Furthermore, not all replies provided all the data we requested in the questionnaire. In some cases the questions did not seem to apply to the particular situation of a department. For this reason, the tabulation of each item will indicate under N.A. (not answered) the number of departments that did not respond to it. At any rate, in view of these problems, the present study should be regarded as a report of the general trends in supervision and training of graduate assistants rather than a set of exact statistical data with clearly defined samples.

II. TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIPS

The normal teaching fellowship stipends and teaching loads were reported by 124 departments representing 81 institutions. Thirty-seven institutions (45.7 percent) had up to four different categories of fellowships with an increased rate of compensation for more experienced instructors, holders of the M.A. degree, or for those who had passed their doctoral qualifying examinations. Of these 37 universities, 24 had two categories of fellowships, 12 had three categories, and one had four categories.

Many departments indicated their current stipends in terms of the total amount, amount per course, or per-credit hour taught. In the majority of cases, when the number of courses assigned to the teaching assistant and their credit hours were known, it was possible to compute some of the missing data by simple arithmetic means. Chart I shows the mean and range of the total as per-course stipends of 67 universities including the actually reported figures and those calculated from the available data. When several departments at the same institution gave different figures, the highest stipends were selected. In general, these figures are not net cash salaries and do not contain tuitions and fees for graduate study even though, presumably, many universities offer a reduced amount

of tuition for their graduate teaching assistants.[6] Furthermore, four departments from four universities mentioned that the stipends were about to be changed. As for the number of courses assigned to the assistants, 42 out of 81 cases (52 percent) gave one course per semester or quarter to their graduate students. Of the remainder, 32 (39.5 percent) gave two courses, and 7 (8.5 percent) assigned one course to category I assistants and two to those in higher categories. Since the institutions letting their assistants teach two courses per semester or quarter offered generally lower stipends per course than those giving one course to them, two separate sets of figures as well as a combined list are given in Chart I.

Ninety-six departments reported the level of courses that their assistants normally teach. In about two-thirds of the cases (67.7 percent) the assistants were engaged in the instruction of the first two years of language courses. In 26 percent they taught the first-year courses only, while in the remaining cases they were assigned to the first- through third-year courses, depending on their experience. In 14 cases (19.7 percent) the higher category or categories of assistantships seemed to indicate an assignment to higher-level courses, whereas in the remaining 57 there did not appear to be any relationship between the category of assistantships and the teaching assignment.

Several language specialists have advocated that students should not be permitted to teach during their first year of graduate study.[7] Their main argument is that the first-year graduate students should devote most of their time and energy to their studies and, at the same time, receive preparatory training for their future teaching activities. The information supplied by 132 departments indicated that such a policy was not implemented in the majority of the programs. Only 15 departments (11.4 percent) gave teaching fellowships to Ph.D. candidates alone, while 83 (62.8 percent) granted them to both M.A. and Ph.D. candidates. In the remaining 33 cases, constituting 25.8 percent, only M.A. candidates were employed, implying that no higher degree was offered in their graduate programs. The number of departments in the last category was higher among the small and middle-sized group, as shown below:

Candidates for	S	M	L	T
M.A. only	19	13	1	33
M.A. or Ph.D.	13	34	37	84
Ph.D. only	6	7	2	15
(N.A.)	15	1	9	25

[6] The names of these institutions and their reported stipends appear in the ADFL Bulletin, previously cited, n. 4. A more general survey of teaching stipends is found in Peggy Heim and Becky Bogard, "Compensation of Graduate Assistants, 1968-69: A Preliminary Survey," AAUP Bulletin, 55 (Dec. 1969), 483-88.

[7] The first four articles and reports cited in n. 3 advocate it strongly.

One would expect that in institutions where a foreign-language graduation requirement is in effect the enrollment in language courses would be quite large, entailing an extensive use of graduate assistants. The table given below summarizes the number of universities and departments and the type of language requirements. The requirement existed in at least 78 out of 92 institutions (84.8 percent), comprising 144 out of 157 language departments (91.7 percent) that responded to the questionnaire. Several replies mentioned that the number of assistants decreased considerably after the language requirement was reduced or abolished. Only one department reported that the abolishment resulted in an increase of enrollment by nearly 20 percent.

Requirement	No. of Institutions	Size of Department		
		S	M	L
None	5	3	3	0
1 year	7	9	1	3
1.5 year	6	6	5	5
2 years	50	22	31	30
2.5 years or more	12	9	10	7
depends on depts.	4	1	3	2
(N.A.)	8	3	2	2

In awarding teaching assistantships, the applicants' qualifications must be taken into consideration. The questionnaire listed eight items and asked the departments to rank them in the order of importance, omitting those that did not apply. A total of 93 departments replied to this question by ranking, and an additional 17 by checkmarking, the items they took into consideration. The primary criteria determining the eligibility for a teaching assistantship were the applicant's academic records, previous teaching experience, and travel or study abroad. Factors such as financial needs, performance on a proficiency test, and recordings by the applicants tended to be ranked lower. Among the items cited by 27 replies were recommendations (16 replies), language fluency (9), and results of the Graduate Record Examination (2). Had "recommendation" appeared as one of the items, it would probably have received high ranking. The summary of the tabulations is given below, listed according to the percentage of the 110 departments that ranked or checkmarked a given item as an important factor, with the median of the various priority ranks assigned to it by the 93 departments:

item	considered important by	median rank
Previous teaching experience	100 %	3
Graduate academic records	97.5 %	1
Undergraduate academic records	95.5 %	1
Travel or study abroad	85.5 %	4
Interviews with applicants	61.0 %	3
Financial needs	48.2 %	5
Performance on a proficiency test	25.4 %	4
Recordings by applicants	18.4 %	5
	(N=93)	(N=110)

The criteria for reappointment as reported by 123 departments (108 rankings, 15 checkmarks) are shown in the table below. Teaching performance and graduate work were the two most important factors. Financial needs of the graduate student were considered important by less than one-half of the departments. The other items cited by several departments included staffing needs (4 cases), fulfillment of various requirements (2), indication of maturity and responsibility (2), and results of proficiency tests (1).

item	considered important by	median rank
Teaching performance	100 %	1
Graduate work	93.5 %	2
Financial needs	46.1 %	3
	(N=123)	(N=108)

One of the most important items in the consideration for a teaching assistantship is the applicant's command of the target language. The teaching of lower-division courses requires not only a mastery of good methods and techniques but also a high degree of language competence. The fact that 85.5 percent of 110 departments considered the experience in travel or study abroad as significant in the selection of graduate assistants is an indirect indication of the importance of language fluency as well as familiarity with the target culture. Yet the testing of the applicant's proficiency is another story. Only 32 out of 157 departments (20.4 percent) seemed to give any kind of test whatsoever to determine the present or prospective assistant's linguistic competence. The breakdown of these 32 replies is as follows: GRE, 15; Oral interviews, 4; Locally made tests, 4; MLA, 2; CEEB, 1; Unspecified, 4. Since, strictly speaking, GRE does not provide adequate information on all the basic language skills, the actual number of departments that attempted to measure their applicants' command of language is brought down to 17, or 10.8 percent of the total replies. Of the departments using tests other than GRE, only one indicated that cut-off scores were used, for its locally produced proficiency test.

III. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING

In any language department the need for a rapid acclimatization of new graduate assistants and their acquisition of good instructional procedures and techniques cannot be overemphasized. Many departments reported formal or informal conferences, workshops, or seminars designed to provide orientation and training for their new junior staff members. In other departments assistants met informally in private consultations or conferences with their supervisor. In addition, two departments indicated that they took a different approach to the problem by offering a one-year preteaching training to their prospective assistants. Chart II shows the type of supervision programs as reported by 136 departments. It should be noted that 43.4 percent of the programs conducted meetings of varying length and content before the beginning of fall semester for the familiarization of the instructors with the various facets of their new responsibilities. The number of cases with orientation meetings increases according to the size of the department (14, 21, and 24 respectively), probably because they are more essential in institutions that employ a fairly large number of new assistants every year. The duration of orientation programs range from half-day briefings to an entire week of systematic training sessions, with the median length of 42 reported samples being three days. One department in the large group mentioned that the new assistants were paid by the university for attending the orientation program. The topics discussed during these introductory meetings are of considerable interest inasmuch as they reveal the kind of training the new teaching assistants undergo in their first year and the degree of emphasis placed on different aspects of their assignments. In general, it appeared that the longer an orientation program was, the more elaborate and systematic was the presentation of basic teaching techniques, theory of language learning, clarification of administrative matters, and so forth. Five sample programs varying from three days to a week in length, given by one small and four large departments, are appended to this study.

The first semester of teaching is a crucial period in the career of new instructors. If not properly guided, they often fail to understand the basic course objectives and the specific methods of implementing and evaluating them. They may also acquire improper teaching habits that will become difficult to correct. In the survey 18 questions were asked in regard to the type of guidance and training given to the new assistants prior to or during their first semester of teaching. The responses to these questions are summarized in Chart III. It reveals quite clearly that many departments, especially those in the middle and large groups, established fairly comprehensive training programs in order to introduce the new assistants to the various aspects of the role of

college instructors. The following is a list of specific topics dealt with in these programs according to the percentage of total affirmative replies from the three groups.

1. Discussion and explanation of the proper use of all the specific instructional materials (91.1%)
2. Detailed descriptions of the lower-level courses taught by the TA's (90.5%)
3. Discussion of various language-teaching methods and objectives (89.8%)
4. Discussion of the role of language laboratory (86.6%)
5. Explanation of various methods of testing and evaluating students' performance (84.1%)
6. Discussion and demonstration of proper techniques for the teaching of audiolingual skills (83.4%)
7. Discussion and demonstration of general classroom methods and procedures (81.6%)
8. Explanation of various university and departmental policies and regulations concerning the assistantships (75.2%)
9. Discussion and explanation of the nature of language learning (73.2%)
10. Discussion and demonstration of proper techniques for the teaching of reading (63.1%)
11. Explanation of the administrative structure of the department (63.0%)
12. Explanation of the placement procedures and the results of the tests for students with previous language study (62.4%)
13. Explanation of the nature of current FL requirement (if any) (58.6%)
14. Language laboratory orientation program for the new TA's (57.9%)
15. Explanation of the specific aspects of teaching performance that will be evaluated by visitors (57.3%)
16. Explanation of the nature of various professional organizations and journals (42.1%)
17. Micro-teaching sessions (31.2%)
18. Discussion of the problems of cultural analysis and methods of teaching culture (28.0%)

As can be seen from the summary above, over 80 percent of the sampled departments demonstrated general classroom instructional methods as well as specific techniques for the teaching of audiolingual skills. Yet it should be noted that the demonstration of proper methods for the teaching of reading skills ranked much lower in frequency and that fewer than one-third conducted micro-teaching sessions. It is doubtful that discussions and demonstrations of appropriate techniques can take the place of teaching practice in simulated classroom conditions. Many of the basic instructional problems and their possible solutions can be brought out and discussed in practice sessions and the most timid graduate students will gain confidence in the methods of initiating warm-up activities, presenting dialogues, giving drills, correcting students, and explaining grammar before they go to their first class.[8] Of the 49 departments that adopted micro-teaching sessions, 17 mentioned the use of videotape facilities, in most cases borrowed from another department. The mean length of individual lesson presentation was 10.4 minutes as compared to 22.2 minutes for those not using the videotapes. As far as the critique session was concerned, the replies were almost equally divided in two major categories of holding it individually or in front of all new instructors.

The oft-voiced complaints that the language laboratory work is poorly coordinated with classroom work may be due in part to the instructors' lack of familiarity with the equipment. While 86.6 percent of the sampled departments spent time discussing the role of laboratory in teaching the target language, only 57.9 percent had laboratory orientation programs to show the potential as well as actual use made of the existing facilities to the new instructors. Another point that should be noted is the low percentage of departments giving an explicit explanation of the specific aspects of the new assistants' teaching performance that would be evaluated by a visitor. In view of the overwhelming number of cases reporting class visits, we should have expected that such procedures were discussed in some detail by many departments. If some kind of checklist were given to novice teachers before their classes are observed, it would probably help reduce their nervousness. Finally, the problems of cultural analysis and methods of teaching civilization, recommended by many language specialists and professional

[8] For the effectiveness of micro-teaching and particularly with the use of videotape facilities, see: Robert L. Politzer, Practice-Centered Teacher Training: French (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1966); Donald Dugas, "Micro-Teaching: A Promising Medium for Teacher Retraining," MLJ, 51 (1967), 161-65; William F. Mackey, The New Technology of Teacher Training (Quebec, Canada: Univ. Laval, 1967) and Practice Teaching: Models and Modules (Quebec, Canada: Univ. Laval, 1967); Jermaine D. Arendt, "Use of the Videotape Recorder in the Training of Modern Language Teachers," Audiovisual Instruction, 13 (1968), 457-59; Joseph Sheehan and Robert Willis, "Demonstration of the Use of Television in the Training of Foreign Language Teachers," in Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Report of the Working Committees, 1969, ed. Mills F. Edgerton, Jr. (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Co., 1969), pp. 109-12.

organizations, seemed to occupy little place in the training of new assistants. From the fact that only 28 percent of the departments included such a topic in their programs, it might be inferred that the understanding of culture through foreign language or explicit introduction of culture, other than that provided by a given textbook, is not a widespread feature of elementary language instruction.

IV. IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The more or less theoretical grounds covered by discussions and explanations before the first semester of teaching are not sufficient to solve all the problems encountered in the real classroom situations. On the one hand the standard and objectives of the lower-level courses must be maintained as uniformly and effectively as possible. On the other hand the concrete questions such as how to evaluate the performance of the assistants, how to give what kind of tests to students, how to assign grades, and a host of other administrative and pedagogical points need to be clarified as they arise gradually. The questionnaire contained 18 questions in regard to the type of administrative and instructional guidance given to the assistants after they have begun to teach. Chart IV shows the tabulation of answers. The percentage of affirmative replies to the 14 questions that could be answered yes or no is given below:

1. Visits to the TA's classes (93.0%)
2. Departmental (course-wide) final examination (83.4%)
3. Availability of a methods course (72.6%)
4. Availability of a course in applied linguistics (65.5%)
5. Keeping the TA's informed of the changes in the profession and the latest developments in methodology (62.4%)
6. Regular meetings with old as well as new TA's (61.8%)
7. Evaluation of TA's by students (59.2%)
8. Checking the TA's individually made quizzes (54.8%)
9. Checking the course grades issued by TA's (53.5%)
10. Demonstration classes (47.8%)
11. Departmental mid-term examination (45.8%)
12. Required conference of the new TA's with the supervisor before issuing course grades (35.6%)
13. Departmental quizzes (35.4%)
14. Self-evaluation of teaching performance by TA's (22.9%)

Ideally speaking, the importance of preteaching training should be equated with that of in-service supervision. Yet the comparison of the list above with the one given under the preceding heading makes it clear that the supervision of the actual teaching done by the assistants was not as complete or widespread as the basically theoretical introduction to language instruction given in pre-service training.

A very high percentage of departments adopted class visits as part of the new Teaching Assistant's performance evaluation. Presumably, of course, such visits are followed by a conference during which specific suggestions and advice are given by the visitor to the novice teacher. Of the 132 cases where the frequency of visits is known, 72 departments or 54.6 percent had their senior staff members visit classes during the first semester only, while in the remaining 60 or 45.4 percent, the visits were made during both semesters. With the former group, the median frequency for all the announced and/or unannounced visits was 2–3 times within the semester while with the latter it was 4 times or more within the year. Four samples indicated that the class visit was done only once during the year, in the first semester. If we interpret replies such as "one class period" or "full class period" as consisting of 45 minutes or more, the length of each visit in almost two-thirds (65.5%) of the 119 reporting departments was 40 minutes or longer. The evaluation of assistants' instruction was made mostly by the senior staff members. Only three large departments mentioned that their "senior TA's" visit classes either for formal or informal observations of teaching activities. The replies to one of the questions under class visits suggest that there were few systematic attempts to develop objective criteria for teaching performance measurement. Good instructional activities can be analyzed as a series of demonstrable functions or "observable behavioral categories." If the visitor's evaluation form contained questions concerning the relative effectiveness with which these categories were carried out, it could be used for the purpose of both measuring and guiding the assistant's instructional performance. Furthermore, it would reduce the type of informal, global, and impressionistic opinions often formed by untrained faculty members. In a sense, formal evaluation is thus a reflection of the nature and amount of supervision exercised in a department. The survey showed that only 39 or 26.7 percent of the departments always used a set evaluation form, with another 4 reporting that such a form was occasionally used.[9]

[9] Eighteen departments sent in their teaching evaluation forms. One such form appears in the article by Hagiwara, previously cited, n. 3. For a discussion of demonstrable behavioral categories, see Politzer, "Toward a Practice-Oriented Program for the Training and Evaluation of Foreign Language Teachers," MLJ, 50 (1966), 251-55. Various aspects of teacher evaluation are discussed in: Jerald R. Green, "Supervision in the Foreign Language Classroom: Guidelines for the Department Chairman," MLJ, 47 (1963), 366-68; Daniel Quilter, Do's and Don't's of Audio Lingual Teaching (Waltham, Mass.: Blaidsell, 1966); Alfred S. Hayes et al., "Evaluation of Foreign Language Teaching," FLA, 1 (Oct. 1967), 22-44; Paul E. Dammer et al., "FLES: A Guideline for Program Review," MLJ, 52 (1968), 16-23; Gertrude Moskowitz, The Foreign Language Teacher Interacts (Minneapolis, Minn.: Assoc. for Productive Teaching, 1968).

Student participation in the evaluation of instructors was a feature of 93 departments. It was regularly done in 36 cases (22.9%) and occasionally in 57 cases (36.3%). In 51 of the samples an evaluation form was always used, implying that some kind of guidance and suggestions were given to students in regard to the specific aspects of teaching and perhaps the course that they were asked to comment on.[10] Twenty-two replies mentioned that the evaluations were run by the student government. Considerably fewer departments (31 out of 157) invited their assistants to judge their own teaching and submit a report to the supervisor. One department using such a system stated that an informal evaluation sheet was given to the graduate assistants for their self-evaluation.

The observable behavioral categories mentioned earlier could be illustrated not only in pre-service training sessions but also in the actual classroom. They could be pointed out, if necessary, in a model class so that they may be emulated by the new instructors. If the model class is a day ahead of the common schedule, the new instructor can benefit even more by incorporating the useful results of their observation in their own lesson plans.[11] The survey showed that model classes were not widely adopted in the training programs. Less than one-half (47.8%) of the departments reported the establishment of such sections and the percentage was considerably lower in the small group (11 out of 52, or 21.2%). Forty-nine out of 75 departments having demonstration classes indicated that the attendance of these classes by the new assistants was obligatory, with a median frequency of five times during the semester. Sixty-six departments mentioned the type of personnel involved in the teaching of demonstration sections: in 33 of them they were taught by the supervisor or the course heads; in 10, by the supervisor and one or more of the experienced teaching fellows; and in 9, by any regular staff member. The participation of teaching assistants in the demonstration classes was found in 23 cases altogether. Only five replies stated that their model sections covered the material one or two days ahead of the course schedule.

The administration of multiple-section courses taught mostly by graduate assistants poses a myriad of problems. One of the primary concerns of the supervisor, aside from the maintenance of the quality of instruction, is the establishment of a fairly uniform standard of evaluation and measurement in all the sections. To an extent this problem may be solved by course-wide examinations,

[10] Ten replies also submitted such forms. One appears in the article by Hagiwara, previously cited, n. 3. Another form with detailed suggestions for administration and analysis is found in Wilbert J. McKeachie, "Student Ratings of Faculty," AAUP Bulletin, 55 (Dec. 1969), 439-44.

[11] For a discussion of the nature and purpose of demonstration teaching, see James Ryan, "Of Spanish Departments and Teaching Spanish," Hispania, 49 (1966), 808-13.

conferences of the assistants with the supervisor concerning quizzes and grades, inspection of the grades issued in each class, and so on.[12] Occasional departmental testing can be of great value also in assessing the success of course objectives and implementation. The majority of departments indicated that course-wide final examinations were administered. Of the 23 replies which stated that the exams were made up by the individual instructors, 7 mentioned that such tests were checked by the supervisor or the course head, and 2 said that the supervisor provided a model that the assistants were to imitate. In the process of acquiring teaching experience, all new instructors should become familiar with test designs, criteria for the selection of appropriate test items, analysis of the results, and problems of grading. In 92 out of 115 reported cases (80%), the assistants seemed to be involved in the production of the final examinations by contributing items or participating in an examination committee. The supervisor or the course heads checked the test items in 101 out of 115 replies (87.8 percent). The smaller number of departments having a course-wide mid-semester examination (45.8%) is explained partly by the fact that the negative replies included cases where no mid-term testing was done. Several departments reported in fact that they gave two or three full-hour departmental tests in addition to the final examination but none at the mid-point of the semester.

In 35.6 percent of the 151 samples, course-wide quizzes were given at various times during the term. This feature was associated more with the middle and large groups. It should be pointed out, however, that we did not give any definition of "quizzes" and "examinations." Since the question on course-wide quizzes preceded those on departmental mid-term and final examinations, it is quite possible that some respondents considered the latter as part of course-wide quizzes. As a result, the number of replies to the item may be quite misleading. At any rate, as many as 10 out of 55 affirmative replies stated that all quizzes were departmental during the semester or the year. Also to be noted as another feature of the middle and large groups was the supervisor's checking of the assistants' individually made quizzes. A cross analysis of the course-wide quizzes and this item shows that as many as 49 departments adopted both practices. The median frequency of the number of tests checked of each assistant was five times per semester. Of 81 replies, 7 stated that up to 7 tests were checked, while 25 reported that all quizzes made by graduate assistants were examined by the supervisor. In multiple-section courses the individual teachers often have different philosophies of grading their students. Two questions were asked with regard to the grades

[12] The administrative problems of multiple-section courses and their possible solutions are discussed in the articles by Dalbor and Hagiwara, previously cited, n. 3. A more detailed treatment is found in John M. Troyanovich, "Optimal Instructional Quality in Multi-Section Teaching," Die Unterrichtspraxis for the Teaching of German, 1968, pp. 69-75.

issued by graduate assistants. In 53.5 percent of the sampled cases the grades in all the sections were checked, and in 35.6 percent the new assistants were required to consult with the supervisor before issuing course grades. Again, these aspects were more typical of the middle and large groups.

One of the most commonly used devices in supervision is the formal or informal meetings of all the assistants or at least of those teaching the same course. Regular meetings with old as well as new assistants were reported in 62.4 percent of the sampled departments. The percentage was higher for the middle and large groups (71.2%), where the need to coordinate the activities of the different sections and to provide a ready means for consultation on instructional problems would be greater. The median frequency of these meetings was twice per month, and the discussion topics in nearly all cases included various administrative matters, testing, instructional problems, and new teaching techniques. Ninety-eight departments (62.4%) also indicated that they attempted to keep their teaching assistants informed of the latest developments in methodology and the changes in the profession. The responses showed that 56 departments conveyed such information through lectures, workshops, and formal or informal meetings; 11 through distribution of memos and copies of journals; and 25 through a required course in methods or applied linguistics.

The relatively high percentage of affirmative replies in regard to the availability of a course in theories of language and language teaching is somewhat misleading. Even though 114 replies indicated that a methods course was offered by the department in question or by another at the same institution, only 39 actually required it of the new graduate assistants. Thirty-seven replies reported the number of credit hours for their required course: in 13 cases it was for 0-1 credit hour, and in 16, 3-4 hours, with the median being 2 credit hours. The course in applied linguistics was available in 103 out of 157 cases, but it was required of new assistants in only 26 departments (16.6% of 157). The median frequency of the credit hours for the required course was 3, with 7 out of 18 reported cases having 1 or 2 hours, and 3 having 4 or 5 hours. Of the total 157 departments, 65, or 41.4 percent had a required course either in methods or applied linguistics, or a combination of both.[13]

[13] Joseph Axelrod, ed., Graduate Study for Future College Teachers (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959), pp. 59-60, states mixed reactions of departments to a course in pedagogy. Some feel it should be required of all graduate students, others of only future teachers, and still others state that any course outside the student's immediate field of specialization should be avoided. On the other hand, many in our profession have advocated that a course in either applied linguistics or methodology should be taken by all graduate students. See Politzer, "Pedagogical Training for our Ph.D.'s," FR, 27 (1953), 136-38; Ernst Pulgram, "Preparation for Language Teaching," in Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, ed. Pulgram, Georgetown Univ. Monograph Series on Lang. and Ling., VI (1954), 75-85, "Linguistics for Language Teachers," FR, 31 (1958), 410-19, "Linguistics for More Language Teachers," FR, 32 (1958), 147-55; "The Preparation of College FL Teachers" (The MLA Conference Report), PMLA, 70 (1955), 57-68; Svein Øksenholt, "The Training of the FL Teaching Assistant," MLJ, 47 (1963), 368-71; Francis J. Dannerbeck, "Toward a Methods Course Requirement at the Graduate Level," MLJ, 50 (1966), 273-74; Raymond Turner, "The Weakest Link in Foreign Language Teaching," Improving College and University Teaching, 15 (1967), 151-55; and also the MacAllister report and the two articles by Stein, previously cited, n. 2 and 3 respectively.

The question concerning the selection of instructional materials was answered by 138 departments. The supervisor alone was responsible for the choice of texts in 43 cases (27.4% of 138). In 49 additional cases (35.8%) he collaborated with the department chairman, regular staff members, a committee, or the staff involved in the instruction of a particular course. In the remainder, texts were chosen by course heads (5 cases), regular staff members (6), a committee (28), all the instructors of a given course (4), and the "director of undergraduate studies" (3).

Forty-seven departments replied affirmatively to the question: "Do you distribute any handbooks, pamphlets, manuals, etc. prepared by the department, college, or the university?" The type of materials given to the teaching assistants differed widely from one department to another. Thirty-two mentioned items having to do with specific instructions for teaching a course such as course syllabus and outline, laboratory tape schedules, and lesson plans. The others included bibliographies or reference books, departmental or university guides, bulletins, catalogues, or regulation handbooks. Three replies included a special department handbook for the assistants concerning policies, basic teaching procedures, testing, and so forth.[14] Three others mentioned that such a handbook or manual was being prepared for distribution in the near future.

The last item requested a description of the extent to which the graduate assistants participated in the supervision, administration, and planning of the courses to which they were assigned. In responding to this question, 50 out of 157 replies (31.2%) stated that the participation was "none," "minimal," "not much," or "almost nothing." Four mentioned that it was "full," "active," "maximum," or "90%" without further elaborations. Many others listed various activities that we might normally expect or require of any teaching assistants such as "preparation and scoring of examinations," "individual lesson plans," and "control of own sections." Almost as many said that their teaching fellows were encouraged to give suggestions, comments, and opinions on the language program. Only three replies commented that the department recognized the experience of the assistants by a systematic granting of more freedom and autonomy in their teaching. Another three mentioned that they provided for a limited participation of assistants in administrative committees where curricular decisions were made. Two reported that a cadre of experienced teaching assistants were invited to participate actively in supervisory and administrative matters such as making course syllabi, arranging

[14] To the writer's knowledge, at least three comprehensive manuals have been printed: Harvard Univ., Dept. of Romance Languages, Teaching Fellow Almanac, revised yearly, 22 pp.; Univ. of Michigan, Dept. of Romance Languages, Instructional Methods and Procedures: A Handbook for Teaching Fellows in French, prepared by Hagiwara, 91 pp.; Pennsylvania State Univ., Dept. of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese, Manual for Graduate Assistants in Spanish, prepared by Dalbor, 74 pp.

for departmental examinations, visiting new assistants' classes, teaching demonstration sections, and acting as course heads. Despite numerous comments that the graduate assistants were "invited to give views," "consulted on various matters," and their "reaction to materials was vital," there seemed to be few opportunities for the formal participation of assistants in the areas where it might add to their teaching experience and also benefit the department.

V. SUPERVISORS

Several questions were asked pertaining to the academic background and the duties of the supervisor. Chart V shows the degrees and academic ranks reported by 129 supervisors and 62 assistant supervisors and the field of specialization of 111 supervisors and 40 assistant supervisors. It reveals that of the 191 persons, 68 or 35.6 percent were holders of the M.A. degree—although, presumably, some of them were working toward their Ph.D.—and that 137 or 71.7 percent of them were in the rank of assistant professor or below. Another point of interest is that the median year in which the Ph.D. was received by the supervisors and their associates was as recent as 1966 and 1967 respectively. While these figures suggest that the supervision of the graduate assistants and the administration of lower-level courses were in the hands of relatively young people who were in all probability familiar with many aspects of modern language-teaching methodology, they may also imply that they held somewhat insecure positions in their departments. Chart V also indicates the field of specialization of 151 supervisors and assistant supervisors. It should be noted that in nearly half of the cases (75 out of 151 or 49.7%) their specialization was literature, in 32 cases (21.2%) linguistics, in 18 cases(11.9%) the combination of the two disciplines, and in the remaining 26 (17.2%), methodology. The high percentage of those in literature might mean that supervisory duties were assigned to a person sometimes not solely on account of his special qualifications.

Charts VI and VII are a summary of the information we requested about the reduction in teaching loads for those with supervisory and administrative duties and their reactions to it. The findings listed in these charts contain several variables so that any definite conclusion may not be warranted. For instance, in some departments the supervisor was assisted in his work by one or more course heads or chairmen who may or may not receive any reductions in their teaching loads and who were not reported in the replies. In any case, an increase in the size of the department and hence in the number of graduate assistants paralleled the rate of reduction in teaching assignments for the supervisory personnel. Chart VI shows the average reduction to be 1.0, 1.9, and 3.3 classes per academic year for the three groups. It should be pointed out that in 47 or 29.9 percent of the observed cases faculty time was not

expressly set aside for supervisory work, implying that it was added to the normal teaching assignments as well as the scholarly activities expected of the faculty members. Analysis of the individual questionnaire revealed that this phenomenon was more prominent in the small group: as many as 37 out of 50 reported cases (74%) in this group gave no compensation in teaching assignments to the supervisors, as against 8 out of 43 known cases in the middle group (18.6%) and 6 out of 39 in the large group (15.4%). Chart VI also indicates that in some departments there were two or more supervisors for each language division. It is interesting to note that quite often an increase in the supervisory personnel resulted in a smaller total reduction in teaching loads for the entire program.

Chart VII is a tabulation of the reactions of 173 supervisors and assistant supervisors toward the compensation in teaching assignments. Again the summary reported in the chart is misleading because the normal teaching load differed from one department to another. Thus a tenured member who normally taught four courses but received a reduction of two courses for supervision might feel satisfied with the arrangement, while an instructor who was expected to teach six classes per year and received only a reduction of two classes might complain of unsatisfactory compensation for his supervisory duties. Likewise, a supervisor receiving much less reduction than his colleagues at comparable institutions may be satisfied with it as long as he receives assistance from other members of the department. In any case, the responses to the question "Do you think the present rate of reduction in your teaching load for the supervisory work you perform is adequate?" were grouped into three categories of satisfied (or yes), dissatisfied (or no), or undecided, the last including comments like "Maybe," "Could do more if time were given," "I am not sure," etc. The tabulation shows that as many as 49 out of 111 supervisors and their associates (44.2%) were dissatisfied with the reduction they received for their work. It should be noted that the ratio of the mean number of graduate assistants supervised and the mean number of courses reduced from normal teaching assignments turned out to be the highest in the "dissatisfied" group. For example, the figure obtained by dividing the mean number of assistants supervised by the mean reduction in teaching loads for the combined three groups was 4.8 for "satisfied," 9.5 for no comments, 9.8 for "undecided," and 14.2 for "dissatisfied." There did not seem to be any particular relation between the number of supervisors in a given department and the type of comments obtained.

CONCLUSION

In all the sampled departments there were programs designed to prepare graduate students for their immediate teaching assignments and classroom responsibilities. The scope of these programs varied widely. Many small departments tended to let each faculty member guide and supervise his assistants as he saw fit. Many large departments offered pre-service orientation followed by a series of meetings between staff and the assistants, and even formal course work in methodology or applied linguistics. In only rare cases did the responses seem to show that the teaching assistantships were merely a means of providing financial support for graduate students and staffing the undergraduate courses. In fact, in the majority of the programs one could see efforts being made toward the preparation of prospective college instructors. The training programs appeared to be fairly widespread in more or less theoretical areas of language instruction, including discussions and demonstrations of proper teaching techniques and general classroom procedures, explanations of course materials, nature of language learning, the role of language laboratory, and so forth. More practical areas of language teaching in which there seemed to be little activity were micro-teaching practicum, establishment of model classes, laboratory orientation program, formal evaluation of teaching performance, and conferences or supervision on quizzes and course grades.

Although in almost half of the sampled departments the increased experience also brought an increase in stipends, no systematic relaxation of supervision was reported by the majority. Few seemed to encourage their experienced assistants to participate actively in the administration and supervision of the elementary language curriculum. One could make a strong case for a greater initiative on the part of the department to provide for a regular participation of senior graduate assistants in language-instruction committees. Such an experience would be valuable for students who will soon be faculty members. Their formal participation would undoubtedly improve channels of communication, provide an effective means of obtaining suggestions and comments, build strong mutual understanding, and give stimulus to many curricular improvements.

A substantial portion of the supervisory personnel appears to be untenured members of reporting departments. A surprising number of supervisors and their associates were dissatisfied with the rate of reduction in teaching loads for their special duties. One of the replies filled out by a department chairman may typify the situation that exists in institutions whose supervisors were not happy with their teaching assignments: "we <u>are</u> concerned and are doing what we can to begin a program. The principal difficulty is getting a budgetary allocation for any kind of supervision and

instruction. All our staff members have heavy teaching and committee loads, and we have not been able to get a special budgetary allocation for training assistants." One of the most pressing problems in the training and supervision of graduate assistants is that of generating sufficient funds to set aside appropriate faculty time for the establishment of an effective program.

The present study points out the strength and weakness of the approaches taken by many departments for the task of preparing their graduate assistants for their future career. We should perhaps remind ourselves frequently that, unlike many others, our is essentially an ingrown profession. Most of our graduate students go to another institution to teach when they finish their studies. Whether they become successful scholars or not, they will be engaged in teaching activities. Our study shows that the typical accusation that the average department offers no supervision, no training courses, and no visiting procedures is not wholly justifiable. Yet, in any program there is much room for improvement. Our graduate students should not acquire college teaching experience as an accidental by-product of their graduate work. The assistantships should offer them as much meaningful and varied teaching experience as possible.

CHART I: TEACHING-ASSISTANTSHIP STIPENDS*

A. Institutions assigning one course per term to TA's

Category of Assistantships	Yearly Stipends Mean	Yearly Stipends Range	Stipends/course/term Mean	Stipends/course/term Range	Number of Samples
No categories	2354	1200–3408	985	600–1594	25
Category I	2193	1200–3240	923	600–1275	16
Category II	2568	1500–3510	1025	720–1318	16
Category III	3309	1750–4158	1176	875–1386	4

B. Institutions assigning two courses per term or two courses in one and one course in another

No categories	2682	2000–3200	656	450– 833	9
Category I	2669	1800–3666	683	400– 933	17
Category II	3188	2400–4000	841	600–1188	17
Category III	3476	2800–4332	885	700–1083	8

C. Both types combined

No categories	2412	1200–3408	864	450–1594	34
Category I	2456	1200–3666	803	400–1275	33
Category II	2951	1500–4000	917	600–1318	33
Category III	3420	1750–4332	1001	700–1386	12

*Part I, 2, A–C of the Questionnaire. All fractions have been omitted.

CHART II: TYPE OF SUPERVISION AND TRAINING*

A=Pre-teaching orientation programs

B=Formal and informal meetings

C=Private conferences and consultations

D=Course in methods or applied linguistics

	S	M	L	T
A	2	1	1	4
AB	3	4	6	13
AC	4	3	2	9
AD	1	2	2	5
ABC	3	6	7	16
ABCD	1	5	6	12
B	3	6	2	11
BC	2	7	4	13
BD	3	2	2	7
BCD	4	5	5	14
C	13	2	0	15
CD	6	2	3	11
D	3	2	1	6
(N.A.)	5	8	8	21

*Introductory section of Part II of the Questionnaire

CHART III: TABULATION OF REPLIES ON PRE-SERVICE TRAINING *

6. Explanation of the various university and departmental policies and regulations concerning the assistantships:

	S	M	L	T
yes	36	40	42	118
no	14	11	7	32
NA	3	4	0	7

7. Explanation of the placement procedures and the results of the tests for students with previous language study:

	S	M	L	T
yes	25	43	30	98
no	24	10	18	52
NA	4	2	1	7

8. Detailed descriptions of the lower-level course (objectives, method of implementation, evaluation, etc.) taught by graduate assistants:

	S	M	L	T
yes	43	50	49	142
no	9	4	0	13
NA	1	1	0	2

9. Explanation of the administrative structure of the department:

	S	M	L	T
yes	29	33	37	99
no	24	21	12	57
NA	0	1	0	1

10. Explanation of the nature of current FL requirement (if any) and its history:

	S	M	L	T
yes	21	40	3	92
no	28	11	15	54
NA	4	4	3	11

11. Explanation of nature of various professional organizations and journals:

*Item numbers correspond to those of the Questionnaire

11. Explanation of nature of various professional organizations and journals:

	S	M	L	T
yes	24	26	24	74
no	28	28	25	81
NA	1	1	0	2

12. Discussion of various language-teaching methods and objectives:

	S	M	L	T
yes	41	54	46	141
no	12	1	3	16
NA	0	0	0	0

13. Discussion and explanation of the nature of language learning:

	S	M	L	T
yes	29	45	41	115
no	24	10	8	42
NA	0	0	0	0

14. Discussion and demonstration of proper techniques for the teaching of audiolingual skills:

	S	M	L	T
yes	34	49	48	131
no	19	6	1	0
NA	0	0	0	0

15. Discussion and demonstration of proper techniques for the teaching of reading skills:

	S	M	L	T
yes	18	40	41	99
no	34	14	8	56
NA	1	1	0	2

16. Discussion and demonstration of general classroom teaching methods and procedures:

	S	M	L	T
yes	29	52	47	128
no	23	3	2	28
NA	1	0	0	1

17. Discussion and explanation of the proper use of all the specific instructional materials for each course:

	S	M	L	T
yes	43	52	48	143
no	9	2	1	12
NA	1	1	0	2

18. Explanation of various methods of testing and evaluating student performance:

	S	M	L	T
yes	34	51	47	132
no	18	4	2	24
NA	1	0	0	1

19. Discussion of the role of language laboratory:

	S	M	L	T
yes	41	51	44	136
no	11	2	5	18
NA	1	2	0	3

20. Language laboratory orientation program for new assistants:

	S	M	L	T
yes	21	36	34	91
no	29	17	15	61
NA	3	2	0	6

21. Discussions of the problems of cultural analysis and methods of teaching culture:

	S	M	L	T
yes	7	19	18	44
no	45	36	31	112
NA	1	0	0	1

22. Micro-teaching sessions

	S	M	L	T
yes	17	14	18	49
no	34	39	30	103
NA	2	2	1	5

	S	M	L	T
a. with: without use of videotape	2:15	6:8	9:9	17:32
b. mean length of individual-lesson presentation	17.5: 24.0	11.6: 23.0	9.3: 20.8:	10.4: 22.2
c. critique session held individually	1:8+	4:3+	4:2+	9:13+
critique session before entire group	1:5+	2:5+	5:6+	8:16+

23. Explanation of the specific aspects of teaching performance that will be evaluated by visitors who will observe the assistant in action:

	S	M	L	T
yes	24	29	37	90
no	28	26	12	66
NA	1	0	0	1

CHART IV: TABULATION OF REPLIES ON IN-SERVICE TRAINING*

24. Availability of demonstration classes

	S	M	L	T
yes	11	34	30	75
no	41	21	19	81
NA	1	0	0	1
a. attendance required	6	22	21	49
b. No. of attendance: frequency range (per semester)	2–6+	2–6+	1–6+	1–6+
median	5 times	5 times	5 times	5 times
c. taught by:				
1. supervisor	2	14	0	16
2. supervisor & course heads	2	3	12	17
3. regular staff	2	3	4	9
4. experienced TA's	1	1	3	5
5. combination of 1 + 4	2	3	5	10
6. combination of 3 + 4	1	4	3	8

25. Departmental (course-wide) quizzes

	S	M	L	T
yes	11	21	23	55
no	39	32	25	96
NA	3	2	1	6
a. median no. of quizzes given (per semester)	6	4	5	5
b. frequency range	2–all	3–all	2–all	2–all

26. Checking the individually made quizzes

	S	M	L	T
yes	22	31	33	86
no	29	21	14	64
NA	2	3	2	7
a. median no. of quizzes checked (per semester)	7	4	3	5
b. frequency range	1–all	2–all	1–all	1–all

27. Departmental mid-term examination

	S	M	L	T
yes	11	30	31	72
no	35	18	36	66
NA	7	7	5	19

28. Departmental final examination

	S	M	L	T
yes	34	49	48	131
no	17	5	1	23
NA	2	1	0	3

a. items produced by : items checked by

	S	M	L	T
supervisor : supervisor	4	6	5	15
regular staff : supervisor	6	0	0	6
committee : supervisor	0	5	12	17
all staff : supervisor	16	28	19	63
all staff : all staff	4	2	1	7
all staff : committee	0	0	2	2
committee : committee	2	0	1	3
others	2	0	0	2
(NA)	(0)	(8)	(8)	(16)
b. exam is individually made by checked by supervisor	4	3	0	7

29. Checking the course grades of students in all sections

	S	M	L	T
yes	19	36	29	84
no	31	18	19	68
NA	3	1	1	5

30. New assistants are required to consult with the supervisor before issuing course grades

	S	M	L	T
yes	9	23	24	56
no	42	31	24	97
NA	2	1	1	4

31. Class visits

	S	M	L	T
yes	45	52	49	146
no	7	3	0	10
NA	1	0	0	1
a. first semester only	25	24	23	72
median frequency of visits	2–3	2–3	2–3	2–3
b. more than one semester	17	22	21	60
median frequency of visits	4+	4+	4+	4+
c. mean length of each visit	40+	40+	40+	40+ (min.)
d. evaluation form:				
regularly used	6	12	21	39
occasionally used	0	1	3	4
never used	37	32	18	87
NA	2	7	7	16

32. Evaluation of assistants by students

	S	M	L	T
yes (always)	13	14	9	36
yes (sometimes)	14	19	24	57
no	25	20	16	61
NA	1	2	0	3
a. use of evaluation form:				
regularly used	14	16	21	51
occasionally used	2	7	9	18
never used	9	9	3	21
NA	2	1	0	3

	S	M	L	T
b. evaluation is student-run	7	8	7	22

33. Assistants evaluate their own teaching and submit reports

	S	M	L	T
yes (always)	4	3	1	8
yes (sometimes)	7	5	16	28
no	42	46	32	120
NA	0	1	0	1

34. Department in question or another department at the institution offers a course in applied linguistics:

	S	M	L	T
yes	27	36	40	103
no	24	18	9	51
NA	2	1	0	3
a. it is required of new TA's				
yes	11	7	8	26
no	15	27	31	73
NA	1	2	1	4
b. median credit hours	4	3	3	3
c. range	3–5+	2–3	1–3	1–5+
d. course is a combination of app. ling & methods	2	1	1	4

35. Department in question or another department at the institution offers a course in methods:

	S	M	L	T
yes	33	39	42	114
no	18	15	7	40
NA	2	1	0	3
a. it is required of new TA's				
yes	10	12	17	39
no	23	26	25	74
NA	0	1	0	1
b. median credit hrs.	3	3	2	2
c. range	1–4	1–3	0–4	0–4

36. Selection of the basic instructional materials for each course:

	S	M	L	T
supervisor	11	14	18	43
supervisor + dept. chair.	2	3	1	6
supervisor +course heads and/or regular staff	9	3	7	19
supervisor + committee	4	4	2	10
supervisor + all staff	6	0	0	6
course heads	3	0	2	5
course heads + reg. staff	6	0	0	6
committee	9	10	9	28
all staff	0	2	2	4
others	1	4	1	6
NA	1	10	5	16

37. Distribution of handbooks, pamphlets, manuals, etc. prepared by the department, college, or university:

	S	M	L	T
yes	19	15	17	51
no	32	38	24	94
NA	2	2	8	12

(breakdown of replies omitted)

38. Keeping the TA's informed of the changes in the profession and the latest developments in methodology:

	S	M	L	T
yes	31	34	33	98
no	19	7	6	32
NA	3	14	10	27

regular means for such activities:

memos, journal copies	5	4	2	11
meetings, workshops, lectures	20	21	15	56
meetings, course work	4	9	12	25
NA	2	0	4	6

39. Regular meetings with old as well as new TA's:

	S	M	L	T
yes	23	42	32	97
no	24	11	8	43
NA	6	2	9	17

a. median frequency of mtgs.	every 2 wks.	every 2 wks.	once a month	every 2 wks.
b. range	wkly.–twice a term	wkly.–once a term	wkly.–once a term	wkly.–once a term

40. What books do you recommend to your TA's in the field of applied linguistics, language teaching, and testing? Please state authors and titles; if any of them are required in a course in methods or applied linguistics, please indicate.
(93 out of 152 depts. replied; analysis of results omitted here.)

41. Please describe the extent to which the regular TA's participate in the supervision, administration, and planning of the courses to which the majority of them are assigned:

typical replies	S	M	L	T
none, not much, minimal	22	18	10	50
encouraged to give views, consulted	9	3	4	16
test construction	4	3	5	12
make own lesson plans	2	4	5	11
give views and construct tests	5	14	16	35
select or vote on textbooks	2	5	1	8
make course syllabi	1	0	1	2
visit other TA's classes	0	0	2	2
members of curriculum and policy committee	1	0	2	3
active, full, maximum	2	0	2	4
NA	5	8	1	14

CHART V: BACKGROUND OF SUPERVISORS AND ASSISTANT SUPERVISORS*

Group	S				M				L				T			
Title	superv.		ass't sup.		superv.		ass't sup.		superv.		ass't sup.		superv.		ass't sup.	
Highest degree held	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA	PhD	MA
Median year of degree earned (19–)	62	66	67	65	67	62	66	67	65	57	67	66	66	61	67	66
range (19–)	38–69	41–68	63–69	65–66	36–69	32–68	59–69	67–68	39–69	49–67	59–69	54–69	36–69	32–68	59–69	54–69
Academic rank																
TA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5
lecturer	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	5	0	2	0	1	0	7	1	7
instructor	0	8	0	1	1	5	1	3	0	3	0	16	1	16	1	20
ass't prof.	15	3	3	1	16	1	2	1	18	5	12	2	49	9	17	4
assoc. prof.	16	0	2	0	5	0	1	0	10	0	1	0	31	-0	4	0
professor	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	16	0	3	0
Specialization																
literature	15	5	2	1	11	4	1	3	16	2	7	8	42	11	10	12
linguistics	8	2	1	2	5	1	2	0	7	2	1	1	20	5	4	3
both	2	2	1	0	2	5	0	0	4	0	2	0	8	7	3	0
methodology	5	2	0	1	3	1	1	1	3	4	0	5	11	7	1	7

*Part IV, 42, A, B, I and 43, A, B, H of the Questionnaire

CHART VI: REDUCTION IN TEACHING LOADS*

No. of Sup. Personnel	Group	No. of Samples	No. of TA's Mean	No. of TA's Range	Total Reduction** Mean	Total Reduction** Range
	S	42	4.8	1– 9	1.6	0–4
1	M	34	14.4	10–19	1.9	0–4
	L	17	31.6	24–60	3.1	0–6
	S	7	5.9	2– 9	0.7	0–1
2	M	6	13.8	10–19	1.3	0–6
	L	13	34.1	24–57	2.8	0–6
	S	1	7	7	?	?
3	M	2	16.0	14–18	1.0	1–3
	L	2	36.5	31–44	3.0	2–4
	S	0	-	-	-	-
4+	M	1	14	14	?	?
	L	7	49.8	28–71	6.4	4–8
	S	50	4.9	1– 9	1.0	0–4
overall	M	43	14.3	10–19	1.9	0–6
	L	39	33.6	24–70	3.3	0–8

* Part IV, 42, E, F, and 43, E, G of the Questionnaire

** In terms of number of courses per year

CHART VII: ATTITUDE TOWARD REDUCTION IN TEACHING LOADS*

		Type of Response			
		Satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Undecided	No comments given
	No. of Samples	18	19	3	20
S	Mean Amount of Reduction**	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.5
	Mean No. of TA's	5.3	5.8	7.3	3.3
	No. of Samples	21	13	1	16
M	Mean Amount of Reduction**	2.4	1.1	1.0	1.3
	Mean No. of TA's	11.2	14.6	12.0	11.8
	No. of Samples	15	17	4	31
L	Mean Amount of Reduction**	3.4	1.1	2.0	1.4
	Mean No. of TA's	22.4	22.2	18.7	14.7
	No. of Samples	54	49	8	67
T	Mean Amount of Reduction**	2.4	1.0	1.3	1.1
	Mean No. of TA's	11.7	14.2	12.8	10.5

* Part IV, 42, E, F, I and 43, D, G of the Questionnaire

** In terms of number of courses per year

PRETEACHING ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

In any language department the need for a rapid acclimatization of new teaching assistants and their acquisition of good instructional procedures and techniques cannot be overemphasized. It is quite obvious that the first semester of teaching is a crucial period in the career of these instructors. If not properly guided, they often acquire improper or inappropriate teaching habits and fail to understand the basic course objectives and the method of implementing and evaluating them. Bulletins, memos, handbooks, course syllabi, and announcements that are often distributed at the beginning of the school year do not adequately prepare the young instructors for their new experience. Even when they take a course in applied linguistics or methodology concurrent with their teaching assignments, many important points are presented or discussed too late in the course for a proper utilization in the first semester of teaching.

One of the most effective means of introducing the graduate students to the teaching career is a pre-semester orientation or workshop program. In less than a week before classes begin, it is possible to explain and demonstrate nearly all the important phases of language instruction and anticipate the type of problems that the new instructors may encounter in the first few weeks of teaching. Ideally, of course, such a workshop should be followed by a required course in applied linguistics or methods as well as regularly scheduled meetings of the graduate assistants where the basic theoretical aspects and practical matters could be explored further and discussed in more detail.

The survey of the training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants revealed that almost 38 percent of the large language departments, or divisions having more than 24 graduate assistants, that answered the questionnaire had instituted some kind of preteaching orientation program. A comprehensive pre-semester workshop might include the following types of topics:

1. Structure of the Institution and Courses
   a. organization of the university, the humanities division, and/or the department
   b. university or departmental policies and regulations concerning the faculty and students
   c. the nature of the foreign-language requirement and its implementation
   d. description of the lower-level courses (instructional goals, methods, materials, the kind of students enrolled, etc.)

2. "Underachievers" and "Problem" students
   a. counseling system
   b. aptitude and placement tests
   c. language-learning disability cases
   d. methods of diagnosing language-learning problems
   e. individual help and conferences with students

3. Theoretical Aspects of Language Instruction
   a. nature of language learning
   b. various teaching methods
   c. rationale for the particular instructional approach
   d. methods of testing and evaluating performance

4. Practical Matters
   a. demonstration of proper teaching techniques
   b. basic use of the instructional materials
   c. typical problems encountered in the first few weeks of teaching
   d. micro-teaching sessions (demonstration of teaching techniques by the new instructors, followed by a critique session)

5. Language Laboratory
   a. its role in language teaching at various levels
   b. demonstration of the use of equipment
   c. demonstration of monitoring methods

6. Others
   a. a talk or panel discussion by old teaching assistants (senior staff members may be excluded)
   b. a discussion of the graduate program and its requirements
   c. type of participation in the administration or supervision expected of assistants when they have gained sufficient experience
   d. description of the staff benefits (tuition, insurance, discounts, etc.)
   e. social get-together of the old and new assistants as well as the senior staff members

Although the "outline" presented above seems rather extensive, an orientation program of this kind can be carried out in four or five days. Some of the topics should be covered by members of the department other than the supervisor or coordinator, such as the chairman, the graduate advisor, some of the senior staff members, course heads, and the experienced teaching assistants. In some cases it may be possible to pay the assistants for coming to the university several days before their colleagues in order to attend the workshop. It may also be possible to give one-hour credit for attendance as a "methods" course or make the program an integral part of a required course in applied linguistics and methodology. Teaching is an important part of the profession for which our graduate students are preparing. We should strive to provide them with a solid foundation of the theory and practice of language instruction and a meaningful experience for their future.

Five sample orientation program schedules ranging from three to five days are appended. Asterisks indicate the topics that are not discussed or explained by the members of the respective language department, such as the dean of the humanities division or the freshmen and sophomores, officers from the health service, language laboratory director, and so forth.

A: EXAMPLE OF A THREE-DAY PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN–Department of Romance Languages (French)

I:	9:00–10:30	Welcome by the Dept. Chairman Distribution of keys, ID cards, in-state tuition slips, etc. Administrative structure of the Dept. Rules on teaching and supervision Brief description of first to third-year courses
	10:45–12:00	Placement Test: procedures, results, and adjustments Language requirement and the lower-level course Theory of language learning Various teaching methods
	2:00– 3:30	Teaching phonology Pronunciation and speaking texts
	3:50– 5:00	Teaching syntax Teaching dialogues Structural drills and demonstration Distribution of the Teaching Fellow Handbook Assignment of micro-teaching lessons

II: 9:00–11:00 Testing and evaluation
Weekly quizzes and course-wide examinations
Discussion of textbooks and other instructional materials

1:00– 3:00 Micro-teaching session (videotaped)

3:30– 5:00 Evaluation of new instructors by visitors during the semester
Problems encountered in the first week

III: 9:00–11:00 Appointments with the Graduate Advisors

11:00–12:00 Language Laboratory and the classroom

1:00– 2:00 *Language Laboratory orientation (Lab Director)

2:00– 4:00 Registration for graduate courses

(There is also a required two-hour course in applied linguistics and a workshop on teaching reading skills.)

B: EXAMPLE OF A FOUR-DAY PROGRAM

HARVARD UNIVERSITY–Department of Romance Languages

I: 10:00 Introductory remarks by the Language Coordinator

10:30 Organization of the Department
Description of the lower-level courses

11:45 The TF Viewpoint (the word from the old hands; persons other than teaching fellows are excluded)

2:00 Teaching methods and psychology of learning

3:30 *The language-testing program–placement and aptitude tests (Office of Tests)

II: 10:00 *The Harvard and Radcliffe freshmen (by the two deans)

10:30 *The problem students and language learning disabilities (Univ. Health Services and Bureau of Study Council)

11:00 *The language laboratory and the audio classroom: demonstration and handling of equipment (Lab Director)

2:00 Supervision, training, and evaluation of teaching performance

III: 10:00 Demonstrations of teaching techniques

2:00 Directed practice, micro-teaching (videotaped)

*Refers to a session conducted by persons outside the department

IV: 9:00 Meetings of course heads with the Coordinator

10:00 Briefing of heads of courses (old and new TF's)

1:00 Luncheon at Faculty Club (all members)

(There is also a required course in applied linguistics, equivalent to three credit hours.)

C: EXAMPLE OF A FOUR-DAY PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA at Los Angeles–Department of Germanic Languages

I: 9:00–10:00 Welcome and opening remarks
California schools

10:00–11:00 General duties of Teaching Assistants

11:00–12:00 Theories of Linguistics

1:00– 2:00 Useful techniques for the audiolingual approach

2:00– 3:00 The teaching of pronunciation

II: 9:00–10:00 "First day in class" and elementary course scheduling

10:00–11:00 Nouns and noun modifiers

11:00–12:00 The Germanic verb system

1:00– 2:00 Modals

2:00– 3:00 The passive voice

III: 9:00–10:00 The language lab
Visit to the lab
Demonstration of equipment

11:00–12:00 Construction of tests and methods of grading

1:00– 2:00 The subjunctive

2:00– 3:00 Word order, idioms, prepositional phrases

IV: 9:00–10:00 The experience of learning a foreign language

10:00–12:00 Demonstration lessons by two Teaching Assistants

1:00– 3:00 Optional individual conferences with supervisors

(no required course in applied linguistics or methods)

D: EXAMPLE OF A FOUR-DAY PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–Department of Spanish and Portuguese

The Teaching Fellows are divided into four groups (A, B, C, and D) for some of the meetings.

I: 10:00 General University and Departmental Policies (Department Chairman)

11:00 *The College of Letters and Sciences and Teaching Assistants (Assistant Dean)

2:00 Teaching Methods: Ways of Approaching Texts

II: 8:00 General Language Laboratory Orientation (A & B)
Faculty Interviews and Performance (C)
Assignment Committee (D)

10:00 same as above–group change

2:00 same as above–group change

III: 8:00 same as above

3:00 Meeting with course chairmen

IV: 10:00 General Departmental Meeting

2:00 Language Lab specialists only–console

3:00 same as above, with student booths

(There is also a required two-semester course of one hour each in methods.)

E: EXAMPLE OF A FIVE-DAY PROGRAM

BROWN UNIVERSITY–Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies

I: 10:00–11:00 General Session

11:00–12:00 Short organization meetings of departmental groups

2:00– 4:00 General session–movie program

II: 10:00–12:00 General session
The Language Lab; sample programs; monitoring; other audiovisual equipment

2:00– 4:00 General session
(Demonstration of teaching techniques by various members of the department)

IV: 10:00–12:00 General session
(Demonstration of teaching techniques by one instructor)

2:00– 4:00 Open for departmental sessions

3:00– 5:00 General session
(Language study at Brown–panel discussion; social hour in the lounge)

(No required course in applied linguistics or methods)

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is by no means exhaustive, especially in its treatment of the topics IV, V, and VI.

I. GENERAL

MacAllister, Archibald T., "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," PMLA, 79 (1964), 29–43. (Reprinted in MLJ, 50 (1966), 78–93).

Based partly on a survey conducted in 1963; contains a number of specific recommendations on the undergraduate language courses and the graduate TA training. Model graduate curriculum with/without previous teaching experience is included.

—, and A. Valdman. Report of the Seminar for College Teachers of French, German, and Spanish. Bloomington: Indiana Language Program, 1964.

A detailed report of the summer institute held at Indiana University in the summer of 1964 in conjunction with Linguistic Institute and Indiana Language Program. The program included the study of psychology of language learning, applied linguistics, methods, and teaching of literature, designed mainly for language-program coordinators and supervisors. Contains a very frank appraisal of its success and failures as well as a series of recommendations.

Pargment, M. S. "Preparation of College Teachers in Modern FLs," Educational Record, 25 (1944): 75–86.

Advocates that teacher training should precede training in scholarly research and that each department should accept the responsibility for both types of training and develop a program adapted to the needs of individual prospective instructors. A number of detailed recommendations include courses in methods, civilization, linguistics, explication de texte, theory of language learning, administration, and supervision.

"The Preparation of College FL Teachers" (The MLA Conference Report). PMLA, 70 (1955): 57–68.

Points out a lack of teacher training for M.A. and Ph.D. candidates and recommends in-service training and courses in applied linguistics, phonetics, teaching methods, and advanced composition and conversation. Recommends also a "certification for college teaching" through course work and tests. Somewhat outdated, but offers many useful suggestions.

Ryan, James. "Of Spanish Departments and Teaching Spanish," Hispania, 49 (1966): 808–13.

Advocates a more target-language oriented approach to curriculum and a strengthening of the teaching assistant's supervision. A detailed discussion of the nature and purposes of demonstration teaching.

Sacks, Norman P. "Training the New College Instructor." In Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern FLs. N. Y.: MLA, 1961. (Reprinted in MLJ, 50 [1966]: 66–69).

Training of graduate students as teachers must receive equal emphasis as training in research. Their language proficiency must be developed and tested. They must receive education in contrastive linguistic analysis, cultural analysis, and professional preparation (teaching methods, testing, evaluation of texts, psychology of learning, etc.).

Stein, Jack M. "Preparation of College and University Language Teachers." PMLA, 76 (May 1961): 12–14.

Points out the reluctance of many tradition-bound departments to pay attention to pedagogical matters. Gives an outline of a minimal program (no teaching during the first year, gradual introduction to teaching, observation of classes, methods course, qualifications of the supervisor, etc. It is essentially based on the program developed by Professor Stein for the German Department at Harvard University.

—, et al. "The Preparation of College and University Teachers," In Northeast Conference on the Teaching of FLs: Report of the Working Committees, 1961, ed. Seymour L. Flaxman. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press. 1961, pp. 32–41.

Criticism of the existing undergraduate and graduate programs for their general lack of practical training and courses for the improvement of language skills. Gives an outline of a three-year curriculum for the preparation of the "scholar-teacher."

Troyanovich, John M. "Optimal Instructional Quality in Multi-Section Teaching." Die Unterrichtspraxis for the Teaching of German (1968), pp. 69–75.

Discusses problems in multiple-section courses and gives practical suggestions for the improvement of the instructional quality through a series of administrative and supervisory innovations.

II. DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

Dalbor, John B. "A Realistic Look at the Training of College FL Teachers." MLJ, 51 (1967): 209–14.

A detailed description of the supervision and training program in the Departments of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese at Pennsylvania State University.

Hagiwara, Michio P. "Training and Supervision of College FL Teachers," FLA, 3 (1969): 90–107.

A detailed description of the program that has gradually evolved in the past several years. Contains teacher evaluation forms to be used by senior visitors and by students.

Nachtman, Francis W. "Practical Training Program for College Language Teachers." MLJ, 47 (1963): 11–13.

Practice in the French Department at the University of Illinois. Points out the weaknesses of some of the preclass workshops. Stresses demonstration and discussion for the teaching of theory and practice. States the advantages of the demonstration class being one day ahead of the other sections.

Remak, Henry H. H. "The Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in German." MLJ, 41 (1957): 212–14.

Program in the German Department at Indiana University. Probably outdated since it was written at the time when only a few TA's were employed, mostly in the first-year course. Contains many suggestions that are useful for relatively small language departments.

Winkelman, John. "Training College Language Teachers." MLJ, 44 (1960): 210–16.

Practice in the German Department at the University of Nebraska. Stresses the importance of a week-long preclass workshop and lists the type of topics to be discussed in the orientation program.

III: ON THE COURSE IN METHODS/APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Dannerbeck, Francis J. "Toward a Methods Course Requirement at the Graduate Level." MLJ, 50 (1966): 273–74.

Insists that the course should be geared directly to actual teaching experience in the classroom rather than to theoretical discussion of teaching goals and methods. Lists topics that should be dealt with in such a course.

Oksenholt, Svein. "The Training of the FL Teaching Assistant." MLJ, 47 (1963): 368–71.

Advocates a graduate-level course in methodology that should be oriented more toward practice than theory. Along with the usual topics, the course should include testing and measurement. Essentially an outline of how a methods course may be organized.

Politzer, Robert L. "Pedagogical Training for our Ph.D.'s." French Review, 27 (1953): 136–38.

Language teaching is an integral part of Ph.D. training: the students must show competence in using any method, carrying on instruction in the FL, etc. Describes the course in applied linguistics that was created at Harvard University.

Pulgram, Ernst. "Preparation for Language Teaching." In Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, ed. Pulgram. Georgetown Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, VI (1954), 75–85.

Expounds the importance of the knowledge of linguistics in college language-teacher training, especially for those who teach lower-division courses.

—, "Linguistics for Language Teachers." FR, 31 (1958): 410-19.

Emphasizes the necessity of linguistic knowledge (descriptive linguistics and the history of the target language) in the Ph.D. candidates as well as other graduate students.

—, "Linguistics for More Language Teachers." FR, 32 (1958) 147–55.

Criticizes methods courses and argues for courses in linguistics that will enable the student to join insight into how languages operate and the structure of the target language. Brief bibliography (now mostly outdated) on general linguistics, description and history of French, old French, phonetics and phonemics of French, and applied linguistics.

Turner, Raymond. "The Weakest Link in FL Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, 15 (1967): 151–55.

An informal essay advocating a methods course for students before they begin teaching and the use of standardized tests to determine their language proficiency.

IV. ON TEACHING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Green, Jerald R. "Supervision in the FL Classroom: Guidelines for the Department Chairman." MLJ, 47 (1963): 366–68.

Discusses the importance of class visits for teacher and course evaluation. Gives a checklist that could be utilized effectively for the appraisal of teachers trained to use the audiolingual method.

Hays, Alfred S., et al. "Evaluation of FL Teaching." FLA, 1 (1967): 22–44.

Points out the weakness in the training and supervision of college teaching assistants. Gives a list of 324 features considered essential in the evaluation of language-teaching techniques and curriculum.

Moskowitz, Gertrude. The FL Teacher Interacts. Minneapolis, Minn.: Assoc. for Productive Teaching, 1968.

Explanation of Interaction Analysis, tallying techniques, matrix interpretation, and tallying exercises with an half-hour tape in French, German, Italian, or Spanish showing examples of the ten categories (corrective methods, feedback, praise, teacher-student speaking ratio, direct-indirect teacher influence and control, etc.).

See also Hagiwara under II.

V. ITEMS RELATED TO DEMONSTRATION OF GENERAL TEACHING TECHNIQUES (FOR PRETEACHING WORKSHOPS)

Arendt, Jermaine D. "Use of Videotape Recorder in the Training of Modern FL Teachers." Audiovisual Instruction, 13 (1968): 457–59.

Discusses various procedures for taping the model as well as regular classes, to be replayed, discussed, and analyzed by the trainees.

Brisley, Leonard, et al. "Good Teaching Practices: A Survey of High School FL Classes." In Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Languages. N. Y.: MLA, 1961)

Comprehensive compilation of interesting and useful ideas to vary the routine procedures in the teaching of the four language skills. Many of the suggestions can be used effectively in college language courses.

Dugas, Donald. "Micro-Teaching: A Promising Medium for Teacher Retraining." MLJ, 51 (1967): 161–65.

Report of the use of videotaped micro-teaching sessions at the NDEA institute for French teachers held at the University of Michigan.

Grew, James H. "Toward Better Classroom Teaching." MLJ, 48 (1964): 83–88.

An informative discussion of do's and don't's in language-teaching methods and techniques.

Politzer, Robert L. Practice-Oriented Teacher Training: French. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1966.

Discussion of the principles and methods of micro-teaching and a compilation of short lessons to be utilized in videotaped micro-teaching sessions.

—, "Toward a Practice-Oriented Program for the Training and Evaluation of FL Teachers." MLJ, 50 (1966): 251–55.

Emphasizes practice-oriented training of teachers. Good teaching is analyzed as a series of demonstrable behavioral categories rather than qualities. Discusses how such categories can be shown to the trainees.

Quilter, Daniel. Do's and Don't's of Audio-Lingual Teaching. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1966.

A compilation of useful hints for lesson plans, use of textbooks in class, how to explain grammar, how to teach pronunciation, how to present dialogues and give oral drills, etc.

(FILM) Principles and Methods of Teaching a Second Language. Produced under the supervision of C. A. Ferguson. Teaching Film Custodians, 25 W. 43rd St., N. Y. 10036.

Five films of about 30 minutes length on (1) The Nature of Language, (2) The Sounds of Language, (3) The Organization of Language, (4) Words and Their Meaning, (5) Modern Techniques in Language Teaching. Accompanied by Instructor's Manual. Available on rental basis from many universities.

(FILM) Successful Use of the Language Laboratory. Produced by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

A series of eight 15-minute teacher-training films concerning the rationale for the laboratory, management and administration, use of the equipment and materials, and testing in the lab. A viewer's guide including further examples, a bibliography, and a source list of materials. For information, write to: Bureau of General and Academic Instruction, Department of Public Instruction, Box 911, Harrisburg, Pa.

VI. HANDBOOKS PUBLISHED BY DEPARTMENTS

Harvard University, Dept. of Romance Languages. Teaching Fellow Almanac (revised yearly), 22 pp.

University of Michigan, Dept. of Romance Languages. Instructional Methods and Procedures: A Handbook for Teaching Fellows in French (1962, 64, 69, prepared by M. P. Hagiwara).

Pennsylvania State University, Dept. of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese. Manual for Graduate Assistants in Spanish (1965, 66, prepared by J. B. Dalbor), 74 pp.